

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Claim Amendments

The Applicant has amended claims 4, 9-10 and 13-14 and claims 1-3, 5-8 and 11-12 have been canceled. Applicant respectfully submits no new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 4, 9-10 and 13-14 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

2. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-3, 9, 11, 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Scheib, DE 19606102A1 published on Aug. 21, 1997 (English language translation). Claims 1-3 and 11 have been canceled, rendering the rejection moot. Claim 9 has been amended to depend from conditionally allowed claim 4 and apparatus claims 13-14 have been amended to correspond to the conditionally allowed method claim 4.

3. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scheib DE 19606102A1 published on Aug. 21, 1997 (English language translation). Claim 10 has been cancelled, rendering the rejection moot.

Claims 8 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scheib DE 19606102A1 published on Aug. 21, 1997 (English language translation), as applied to claims 1 and 12 above, and further in view of Zvonar (U.S. 6,504,884).). Claims 8 and 12 have been cancelled, rendering the rejection moot.

Claims 5 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scheib DE 19606102A1 published on Aug. 21, 1997 (English language translation), as applied to claims 1 and further in view of Luschi EP0954142, (published on 3/11/1999).). Claims 5 and 6 have been cancelled, rendering the rejection moot.

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scheib DE 19606102A1 published on Aug. 21, 1997 (English language translation), in view of Luschi EP0954142, (published on 3/11/1999) as applied to claim 6 above, and further in view of Bahrenburg et al. (U.S. 6,606,314).). Claim 7 has been cancelled, rendering the rejection moot.

4. Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 4 stands objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. As the Examiner has suggested, claim 4 has been rewritten in independent form including all limitation of the base claims and any intervening claims. Therefore no amendments have been made to narrow the scope of the pending claims or to create any sort of estoppel.

Consequently, the Applicant believes claims 4, 9-10 and 13-14 are in a condition of allowance. The Examiner's consideration of these claims is also respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael Cameron
Registration No. 50,298

Date: December 4, 2008

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024
(972) 583-4145
michael.cameron@ericsson.com